



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,074	04/23/2004	Feng Liang	8001-001-05	7673

24510 7590 01/30/2007
DLA PIPER US LLP
ATTN: PATENT GROUP
1200 NINETEENTH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

MILLER, MARINA I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

78

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/830,074	Applicant(s) LIANG, FENG	
	Examiner Marina Miller	Art Unit 1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 32-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 33-53 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30, 32 and 54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/23/04 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on 11/21/2006 is acknowledged.

Applicant also elected the following species:

Species A: nucleic acids.

Species B: gene name.

Species C: organism.

Species D: the EBI GOA project.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse. MPEP § 818.03(a).

Claims 1-30 and 32-54 are pending.

Claim 31 is cancelled.

Claims 33-53 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to nonelected inventions and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claims.

An action on the merits of claims 1-30, 32, and 54, as they read on the elected species, follows.

Drawings

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because informal drawings submitted by applicants on 4/23/2004 are poor quality. Specifically, some hand-written words are illegible in each of Figures 1, 2, 5-9, and 16. There

Art Unit: 1631

are apparent “cross-outs” in many Figures, rendering it unclear just what is intended to be shown. In many Figures, lines from Figure numbers/legends cross through other parts of the Figure, also rendering the Figures unclear. See, for example (but not exclusively), Fig’s 11-13. In addition, Figure 13 comprises a legend “e-value” which does not appear to be associated with any other part of the Figure (e.g. a list of values).

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because Figure 2 fails to show an “entry” labeled as “1” as described in paragraph 121 of the specification. In figure 4, while there is a label “D”, there is no part or “button” associated with the label. It is noted that a “button” for each of “A” to “D” is described in paragraph 131 of the specification. Figure 7 fails to show a part “302” as described in paragraph 144 of the specification. It is noted that Figure 7 does show a part “302M” which is NOT described by the instant specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet”

or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action.

Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-30, 32, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 54 recite in the preamble "biological content and their products and/or services listed on an electronic ... file." It is not clear what "their" products are intended. It is also unclear whether the terms "their products" and/or "services" refer to "biological content" or "procuring". As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 1-30, 32, and 54 are indefinite.

Claim 1 recites the limitations "a server which accesses ... storage medium" and "extracts ... are generated" in lines 6 and 8, respectively. It is not clear whether "accessing" and "generating" are intended to be active positive method steps or merely an intended result of the method. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 1-30, and 32 are indefinite.

Claims 1, 13 and 14 recite the limitation “an appropriate request” and “an “appropriate content” shown to a user. The metes and bounds of the claims are not clear because criteria of “appropriateness” are not clear, and neither the claims nor the specification defines the limitation. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 1-30 and 32 are indefinite.

Claims 1 and 54 each recite a final paragraph beginning “wherein said at least one menu sorts ... “ or “wherein said server generates” It is not clear whether the limitations recited in the “wherein” clause that concludes each claim is intended to limit (or actually BE) method steps OR is intended to limit the output page or data OR some other limitation is intended. If a limitation of the data or output page is intended, then it is not clear what further limitation of data used in the claimed method is intended by the methods of manipulating the data (e.g., sorting and displaying). If the former, then the claims should be rewritten using active, positive claim language, and each separate step should be delineated on a new line and should be indented. It also unclear whether what limitation of the claimed METHOD or SERVER is intended by reciting an intended result, i.e., “to enable a user to differentiate products and to procure...” or “that allows a user to procure” As the intended limitations are not clear, claims 1-30, 32, and 54 are indefinite.

Claim 9 recites the limitation “the method of claim 1, wherein the request comprises inputting a parsable biological attribute.” Claim 9 depends from claim 1 which recites “inputting a request.” Thus, claim 9 essentially recites inputting a request wherein the request comprises inputting. It is not clear whether claim 9 is intended to FURTHER limit the “in putting” step of claim 1, or is intended to be a different step of inputting a parsable biological attribute or whether

some other limitation is intended. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 9-12 and 22-30 are indefinite.

Claim 11 recites the limitation “the keyword module and annotation module.” Claim 12 recites “the sequence module.” The antecedent basis of these limitations is not clear because claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 9 which recites “a module for entering keywords, annotations, sequences, and identification numbers.” It is not clear whether the keyword module and annotation module recited in claim 11 is intended to be the same module or two different modules. It is further unclear whether a module for entering keywords and annotations recited in claim 9 is intended to be “the keyword module and annotation module” recited in claim 11. It is also unclear whether the module for entering keywords and annotations recited in claim 9 is intended to be “the sequence module” recited in claim 12. As it is unclear whether a single module (as recited in claim 9) or multiple modules are actually intended (as indicated by the language of claims 11 and 12), claims 11 and 12 are indefinite.

Claim 13 recites the limitation “the request comprises a keyword jump consisting of accessing a browser in which the user is shown appropriate content to retrieve records.” It is not clear what further limitation is the method of claim 1 is intended by reciting “the request comprising a jump consisting of accessing a browser.” It is further unclear whether “accessing a browser” and “to retrieve records” are intended to be active, positive method steps or merely intended results of the “inputting a request” step of claim 1. Claim 13 depends from claims 1 and 2 that recite inputting a request. Thus, claim 13 essentially recites inputting a request wherein the request comprises accessing. It is further unclear “inputting a request comprising accessing a

Art Unit: 1631

browser” or some other limitation is intended. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 13-21 are indefinite.

Claim 16 recites the limitation “wherein the ontology category database is updated by accessing ... databases ... on ... servers.” It is not clear whether the recited limitation is intended to limit the method steps OR the database. If the latter, then it is not clear what further limitation of data is intended by the requirement that the data be “updated.” If the former, then the claims should be rewritten using active, positive claim language. It is specifically unclear whether “updating” and “accessing” are intended to be active, positive method steps or merely an intended use/result of the method. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 16-17 are indefinite.

Claim 17 recites the limitation “using a Web robot to search.” It is not clear what specific step or steps are intended to be encompassed by the term “using”. As the intended limitation is not clear, claim 17 is indefinite.

Claim 19 recites the limitation “ wherein a tabbed sub-window triggers a page load to access the separate keyword jump browser.” It is not clear whether “triggering” and “accessing” are intended to be active positive steps or merely an intended use/result of the method. As the intended limitation is not clear, claim 19 is indefinite.

Claims 19-20 recite the limitation “the separate keyword jump browser.” The antecedent basis of the limitation “the separate keyword jump browser” is unclear because parental claims 1, 2, and 13 do not recite “a separate keyword jump browser” or “a keyword jump browser,” but only recite “a keyword jump consisting of accessing a browser.” As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 19-21 are indefinite.

Claim 20 recites the limitation “the ... browser is indexed and displays.” It is not clear whether the recited limitation is intended to limit the method steps OR the data. It is specifically unclear whether “indexing” and “displaying” are intended to be active, positive method steps or merely an intended result of the method. If one or more method steps is/are intended, then is further unclear whether the “browser” is intended to display an index of some sort, or whether an “indexed browser” displays something (data) or whether a browser both indexes and displays data simultaneously, etc. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 20-21 are indefinite.

Claim 22 recites the limitation “the ... display provides matches into a result based on the inputted request.” It is unclear whether the recited limitation is intended to limit the method steps OR the data. It is specifically unclear whether “providing” is intended to be an active, positive method step or merely an intended result of the method. It is further unclear whether “providing” is intended to make a match, which is then displayed, or whether the “display” IS the “provision” of a match; i.e. the match is displayed. It is further unclear what “result” is intended, e.g., generating a page, retrieving extracts, or some other result, AND it is unclear what relationship is intended between a request and the result in order for one to be “based on” the other. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 22-30 are indefinite.

Claim 23 recites the limitation “the displayed format page.” The antecedent basis of the limitation is unclear because the parental claims do not recite “a displayed format page.” As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 23-30 are indefinite.

Claim 24 recites the limitation “the GUI is activated by the user, such activation triggers the page to be transmitted to a purchase database server.” It is not clear whether “activating”, “triggering”, and/or “transmitting” are intended to be active, positive method steps or merely

Art Unit: 1631

intended results of the method. If these are merely intended results, then it is further unclear what limitation of the claimed METHOD STEPS is/are intended by reciting intended results.

Applicant is reminded that steps should be recited using **active**, positive verbs. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 24-27 are indefinite.

Claim 24 recites the limitation steps/sub-steps (i)-(iii). It is not clear where these steps/sub-steps fit within the parental claims. Specifically, it is not clear whether limitations (i)-(iii) represent additional steps to those recited in the parental claim OR limitations (i)-(iii) are sub-steps of one of the steps recited the parental claim. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 24-27 are indefinite.

Claims 25-27 recite steps/sub-steps (a)-(c). It is not clear where these steps/sub-steps fit within the parental claims and specifically, within steps/sub-steps (i)-(iii) recited in claim 24. As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 25-27 are indefinite.

Claim 25 recites the limitation “the customer information” and “the transmitted data.” The antecedent basis of the limitation is unclear because the parental claims do not recite “customer information” and “transmitted data.” As the intended limitation is not clear, claims 25-26 are indefinite.

Claim 26 recites the limitation “adding customer information.” Parental claim 25 recites “the customer information” therefore it is not clear whether claim 26 refers to the same customer information as that recited in claim 25 or is adding different information. As the intended limitation is not clear, claim 26 is indefinite.

Claim 27 recites in sub-step (b) “storing the user activity” and in sub-step (c) “associating user activity.” The antecedent basis of the limitation “the user activity” is unclear because the

Art Unit: 1631

parental claims do not recite “a user activity,” but recite multiple activities, e.g., inputting a request, activating the GUI, *etc.* Therefore, it is not clear what “user activity” is intended in claim 27. It is unclear whether the “user activity” in sub-step (c) is intended to be the same as that of sub-step (b) and the parent claims, or is intended to be a different user activity. As the intended limitation is not clear, claim 27 is indefinite.

Claim 30 recites the limitation “the public server is maintained by a government institution.” It is not clear what further limitation of the method or data used in the method is intended. If a limitation of the data is intended, then it is not clear what further limitation of data used in the claimed method is intended by reciting a provider/maintainer of data. If a method step is intended, then the claims should be rewritten using active, positive claim language. As the intended limitation is not clear, claim 30 is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-30, 32, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chamberlin, U.S. Patent 6,941,317.

Chamberlin discloses a computer-based method for searching and displaying biological data from various databases (abstract). Chamberlin discloses interfacing by a user via a user terminal and bi-directional connections with a target item server which accesses electronic storage medium (databases) and extracts biological attributes of a target item (fig. 1-20; claims 1, 9; col. 4-5, 8-10, 14). Chamberlin discloses inputting a request, retrieving extracts, and generating a page comprising a hierarchical menu output based on the extracts (fig. 1-20; claims 1, 9). Thus, Chamberlin anticipates claims 1 and 8. Chamberlin discloses multiple browsers (fig. 1-3, 6), thereby anticipating claim 2. Chamberlin discloses biological products related to nucleic acids (fig. 6-20), thereby anticipating claims 3-4. Chamberlin discloses annotated text strings consisting of a unique name, base text, biologically related annotations, and gene ontology (fig. 18-20; col. 15-17 and examples 3-5), thereby anticipating claims 5-7. Chamberlin discloses inputting a biological attribute in a sub-window accessible module for entering keywords, annotations, sequences, and IDs (fig. 7-20), thereby anticipating claim 9. Chamberlin discloses an organism as a biological attribute (fig. 12), thereby anticipating claim 10. Chamberlin discloses keyword and annotation modules (fig. 12-20) and using various searching mechanisms (col. 2, lines 15-40; col. 3, line 43 through col. 5, line 47; col. 6, lines 40-67; col. 15, line 33 through col. 18, line 44), thereby anticipating claim 11. Chamberlin discloses a BLAST search (col. 2, lines 35-40), thereby anticipating claim 12. Chamberlin discloses a keyword jump consisting of accessing a browser (fig. 1-4, 12-13, 19; col. 16, lines 23-47), thereby anticipating

Art Unit: 1631

claim 13. Chamberlin discloses a gene ontology database (fig. 19; col. 2, line 41 through col. 4, line 14), thereby anticipating claim 14-18. Chamberlin discloses triggering a page load by a tabbed sub-window, a tree navigation structure, and an output display providing matches (fig. 7-20), thereby anticipating claims 19-22. Chamberlin discloses GUI and a gene ID, definition of the expressed product, gene symbol, and accession number (fig. 7-20), thereby anticipating claim 23. Chamberlin discloses a system for performing his method (fig. 1-20), therefore anticipating claims 32 and 54.

Claims 1-30, 32, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sabatini, US 5,966,712.

Sabatini discloses a computer-based method for providing sequences of biological molecules in a relational format allowing retrieval in a client-server environment (col. 1, lines 20-24). Sabatini discloses interfacing by a user via a user terminal and bi-directional connections with a target item server which accesses electronic storage medium (databases) and extracts biological attributes of a target item (fig. 2, 5; claims 1-9; col. 11-14). Sabatini discloses inputting a request, retrieving extracts, and generating a page comprising a hierarchical menu output based on the extracts (fig. 2, 5-6; col. 20-24). Thus, Sabatini anticipates claims 1 and 8. Sabatini discloses multiple browsers (fig. 2), thereby anticipating claim 2. Sabatini discloses biological products related to nucleic acids (fig. 5-6; col. 8-11), thereby anticipating claim 3-4. Sabatini discloses annotated text strings consisting of a unique name, base text, biologically related annotations, and gene ontology (fig. 3-6; col. 15-19, example 1), thereby anticipating claims 5-7. Sabatini discloses inputting a biological attribute in a sub-window accessible module

Art Unit: 1631

for entering keywords, annotations, sequences, and IDs (fig. 3-6; tables in col. 25-26; example 1; claim 1), thereby anticipating claim 9. Sabatini discloses an organism as a biological attribute (example 1 in col. 26-27), thereby anticipating claim 10. Sabatini discloses keyword and annotation modules (fig. 3-6; col. 6, lines 38-41) and using various searching mechanisms (col. 9-11, col. 22, line 33 through col. 29, line 22), thereby anticipating claim 11. Sabatini discloses a BLAST search (col. 6, line 42 through col. 7, line 36), thereby anticipating claim 12. Sabatini discloses a keyword jump consisting of accessing a browser (fig. 1-4, example 1), thereby anticipating claim 13. Sabatini discloses a gene ontology database (fig. 2-6), thereby anticipating claim 14-18. Sabatini discloses triggering a page load by a tabbed sub-window, a tree navigation structure, and an output display providing matches (Example 1), thereby anticipating claims 19-22. Sabatini discloses GUI and a gene ID, definition of the expressed product, gene symbol, and accession number (fig. 1-6; col. 20, line 30 through col. 33, line 11), thereby anticipating claim 23. Sabatini discloses a system for performing his method (fig. 1-6), therefore anticipating claims 32 and 54.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1631

Claims 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamberlin, US 6,941,317, as applied to claims 1-30, 32, and 54 above, in view of Venkatesan, US 6,282,550.

Chamberlin teaches the method and the system of claims 1-30, 32, and 54, as set forth above. Chamberlin also discloses various servers and private and government databases (col. 2-4).

Chamberlin does not disclose a GUI for purchasing and transmitting an order for a product selected by a user.

Vankatesan discloses a method for providing information to a customer who is requesting a synthesis of a polypeptide or polynucleotide (abstract, fig. 5). Vankatesan discloses a GUI for purchasing a user-selected product (fig. 6), thereby anticipating claim 23. the GUI is activated by a user and the content is transmitted to a server, wherein the server verifies the transmission, enters the order, stores the selected items, and updates the shopping cart (col. 5, line 29 through col. 8, line 39; fig. 1-6). Vankatesan further discloses comparing the customer information with the previously selected information, matching the information, and adding the customer information to the purchase server database (claims 1-2, 23-29; col. 3, line 3 through col. 4, line 47; col. 5, line 66 through col. 6, line 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the method of Chamberlin to display a purchase option GUI, such as taught by Vankatesan, where the motivation would have been to improve and simplify requesting biological information for purchase by a user from a service provider, as taught by Vankatesan, col. 1, lines 15-44).

Claims 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sabatini, US 5,966,712, as applied to claims 1-30, 32, and 54 above, in view of Venkatesan, US 6,282,550.

Sabatini teaches the method and the system of claims 1-30, 32, and 54, as set forth above. Sabatini also discloses various servers and private and government databases (col. 1, lines 57-67; col. 5, line 31 through col. 6, line 6).

Sabatini does not disclose a GUI for purchasing and transmitting an order for a product selected by a user.

Vankatesan discloses a method for providing information to a customer who is requesting a synthesis of a polypeptide or polynucleotide (abstract, fig. 5). Vankatesan discloses a GUI for purchasing a user-selected product (fig. 6), thereby anticipating claim 23. the GUI is activated by a user and the content is transmitted to a server, wherein the server verifies the transmission, enters the order, stores the selected items, and updates the shopping cart (col. 5, line 29 through col. 8, line 39; fig. 1-6). Vankatesan further discloses comparing the customer information with the previously selected information, matching the information, and adding the customer information to the purchase server database (claims 1-2, 23-29; col. 3, line 3 through col. 4, line 47; col. 5, line 66 through col. 6, line 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to modify the method of Sabatini to display a purchase option GUI, such as taught by Vankatesan, where the motivation would have been to improve and simplify requesting

Art Unit: 1631

biological information for purchase by a user from a service provider, as taught by Vankatesan, col. 1, lines 15-44).

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marina Miller whose telephone number is (571)272-6101. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-6, M-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang, Ph. D. can be reached on (571)272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MM

MARJORIE A. MORAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Marjorie A. Moran
1/22/07

Marina Miller
Examiner
Art Unit 1631